

PRG



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/318,105	05/24/1999	EMMANUEL GERLOVIN	PAS-094	9928

959 7590 07/28/2003

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD  
28 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

DAY, HERNG DER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

10

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/318,105	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GERLOVIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Herng-der Day	<b>Art Unit</b> 2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2003 and 02 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 06 January 2003 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to Applicants' Amendment and Response (paper # 7) to Office Action dated October 4, 2002 (paper # 6), mailed January 6, 2003, and Applicants' Response (paper # 9) to Office Action dated March 11, 2003 (paper # 8), mailed May 2, 2003.

1-1. Claims 8, 13, 14, and 26 have been amended; claims 1-26 are pending.

1-2. Claims 1-26 have been examined and claims 1-26 have been rejected.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on January 6, 2003, have been disapproved because they introduce new errors into the drawings.

2-1. It appears that "NETWORK ADAPTER 80", as shown in Fig. 5, should be "NETWORK ADAPTER 70".

2-2. It appears that "INITIAL MODEL 132", as shown in Fig. 9, should be "INITIAL MODEL 130".

#### ***Specification***

3. The Examiner has acknowledged that page 6 has been amended. The original drawings objection, section 2-2 of paper # 6, has been withdrawn.

4. The Examiner thanks Applicants' submitting of Pro/Engineer 2000i material. It has been placed in the application file. However, as required in paper # 8, earlier versions have not been found.

5. The amendment filed January 6, 2003, is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The amended material, which is not supported by the original disclosure, is as follows:

(1) Added lines 3-4 of claim 8, as described in page 11 of paper # 7.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 8 added the limitation "executing an object method recorded in said model of an object" in line 3 of the claim. However, the recorded "object method" does not appear to be supported by the original specification. In other words, Claim 8 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 9-14 are rejected as being dependent on the rejected claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 19-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Fane “Your Table Is Waiting...”, CADalyst, January 1999, pages 70-75.

9-1. Regarding claim 1, Fane discloses a computer system running a computer-aided design (CAD) package (Autodesk Mechanical Desktop, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1) and an external application program (EAP) (Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, page 74, Figure 5), a method, comprising the steps of:

providing a model of an object in the CAD package, wherein said model includes output data from the EAP (Excel spreadsheet, page 75, column 2, paragraph 1);

modifying the model (editing a value, page 72, column 3, paragraph 4 through page 74, column 1, paragraph 1);

determining that the modifying of the model requires recalculation of the output data from the EAP (creates a spreadsheet, page 74, column 2, paragraph 2); and

in response to the determining, sending new input data to the EAP and obtaining new output data from the EAP (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraphs 2-3).

9-2. Regarding claim 2, Fane further discloses a step of calling the EAP from the CAD package to obtain the new output data (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraphs 2-3).

Art Unit: 2123

9-3. Regarding claim 5, Fane further discloses that the EAP performs analysis on at least a portion of the model to produce the original output data and the new output data (cells within the spreadsheet can contain formulas and references to other cells within the spreadsheet, page 75, column 2, paragraph 1).

9-4. Regarding claim 6, Fane further discloses that the analysis is an engineering analysis (cells within the spreadsheet can contain formulas and references to other cells within the spreadsheet, page 75, column 2, paragraph 1).

9-5. Regarding claim 7, Fane further discloses a method comprises the steps of:

further modifying the model (editing a value, page 72, column 3, paragraph 4 through page 74, column 1, paragraph 1);

determining that the further modifying of the model requires further recalculation of the output data from the EAP (creates a spreadsheet, page 74, column 2, paragraph 2); and

in response to the determining that the further modifying of the model requires further recalculation of the output data, obtaining new output data from the EAP (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraphs 2-3).

9-6. Regarding claim 8, Fane discloses a computer system having a computer-aided design (CAD) package (Mechanical Desktop, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1) for manipulating a model of an object, a method, comprising the steps of:

exporting data from a CAD model in a CAD program to an external application program (EAP) (fills the current value in the cell of a spreadsheet, page 74, column 2, paragraph 2);

using the exported data as input data to execute the EAP and obtain output data from the EAP (cells within the spreadsheet can contain formulas and references to other cells within the spreadsheet, page 75, column 2, paragraph 1);

importing the output data into the CAD program from the EAP (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraph 3);

integrating the output data into the CAD model (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraph 3);

modifying the CAD model so that the input data to the EAP changes to new input data (editing a value, page 72, column 3, paragraph 4 through page 74, column 1, paragraph 1);

updating the output data by calling the EAP and passing the new input data to the EAP following the modification of said model (creates a spreadsheet, page 74, column 2, paragraph 2); and

automatically integrating the updated output data into the CAD model without a user request (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraph 3).

**9-7.** Regarding claim 11, Fane further discloses that the CAD model is a feature-based model (Mechanical Desktop is a feature-based parametric solid modeler, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1).

**9-8.** Regarding claim 12, Fane further discloses that the CAD model is a parametric model (Mechanical Desktop is a feature-based parametric solid modeler, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1).

**9-9.** Regarding claim 13, Fane further discloses that at least one of said integrating the output data into the CAD model and said automatically integrating the updated output data into the

Art Unit: 2123

CAD model comprises adding parameters to the CAD model (add specific values, page 74, column 2, paragraph 4 through page 75, column 1, paragraph 1);

**9-10.** Regarding claim 14, Fane further discloses that at least one of said integrating the output data into the CAD model and said automatically integrating the updated output data into the CAD model comprises adding geometric entities to the CAD model (add more rows, page 74, column 2, paragraph 4 through page 75, column 1, paragraph 1).

**9-11.** Regarding claim 19, Fane discloses a computer system running an external application program (EAP), and a computer-aided design (CAD) package with a model of an object that includes output data from the EAP, a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method, comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

modifying the model (editing a value, page 72, column 3, paragraph 4 through page 74, column 1, paragraph 1);

determining that the modifying of the model requires recalculation of the output data from the EAP (creates a spreadsheet, page 74, column 2, paragraph 2); and

in response to the determining, sending new input data to the EAP and obtaining new output data from the EAP (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraphs 2-3).

**9-12.** Regarding claim 20, Fane further discloses a step of calling the EAP from the CAD package to obtain the new output data (current values, page 74, column 2, paragraphs 2-3).

**9-13.** Regarding claim 23, Fane further discloses that the EAP performs analysis on at least a portion of the model to produce the output data and the new output data (cells within the spreadsheet can contain formulas and references to other cells within the spreadsheet, page 75, column 2, paragraph 1).



**9-14.** Regarding claim 24, Fane discloses a computer system having a computer-aided design (CAD) package for manipulating a model of an object, a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method, comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

importing output data into the CAD program (Mechanical Desktop, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1) from an external application program (EAP) (Excel spreadsheet, page 75, column 2, paragraph 1);

integrating the output data into the model (page 75, column 2, paragraph 1);

modifying the model so as to require updating of the output data (editing a value, page 72, column 3, paragraph 4 through page 74, column 1, paragraph 1); and

automatically updating the output data by calling the EAP with new input data without a user request (page 74, column 2, paragraphs 2-3).

**9-15.** Regarding claim 25, Fane further discloses that the model is feature-based (Mechanical Desktop is a feature-based parametric solid modeler, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1).

**9-16.** Regarding claim 26, Fane further discloses that the model is parametric (Mechanical Desktop is a feature-based parametric solid modeler, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**10.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fane "Your Table Is Waiting...", CADalyst, January 1999, pages 70-75, in view of Cottrell et al., "CHDStd – A Model for Deep Submicron Design Tools", Design Automation Conference 1998, Proceedings of the ASP-DAC 1998, Asia and South Pacific, pages 249-255.

11-1. Regarding claim 3, Fane discloses that the Mechanical Desktop establishes a link to an external Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (page 74, Figure 5) but fails to explicitly disclose the step of registering the EAP with the CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callback registration includes the function to be called and optional application-data to be passed (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to improve the portability.

11-2. Regarding claim 4, Fane discloses that the Mechanical Desktop establishes a link to an external Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (page 74, Figure 5) but fails to explicitly disclose the registration of a callback to the EAP from the CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback to the EAP from the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to improve the portability.

**11-3.** Regarding claim 9, Fane discloses that the Mechanical Desktop establishes a link to an external Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (page 74, Figure 5) but fails to explicitly disclose the step of registering the EAP with the CAD program. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callback registration includes the function to be called and optional application-data to be passed (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD program to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to improve the portability.

**11-4.** Regarding claim 10, Fane discloses that the Mechanical Desktop establishes a link to an external Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (page 74, Figure 5) but fails to explicitly disclose the registration of a callback that is called from the CAD program to access the EAP. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback that is called from the CAD program to access the EAP to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to access the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to improve the portability.

**11-5.** Regarding claim 15, Fane discloses a computer-aided design (CAD) system (Mechanical Desktop, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1), comprising:

- a CAD program (a part generated by the CAD program is shown in Figure 6, page 75);
- an external application program (EAP) that is external to the CAD program (Excel spreadsheet, page 75, Figure 6);

- a model of an object that contains output data from the EAP (page 75, Figure 6);

Fane does not explicitly disclose a registration facility. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD program so that the CAD program calls the EAP when the output data from the EAP in the model need updating as a result of changes to the model to improve the portability.

**11-6.** Regarding claim 16, Fane discloses a computer-aided design (CAD) system but fails to explicitly disclose a registration facility to register a callback from the CAD program to the EAP. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to

Art Unit: 2123

be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback from the CAD program to the EAP to improve the portability.

11-7. Regarding claim 17, Fane further discloses that the model is a feature-based model (Mechanical Desktop is a feature-based parametric solid modeler, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1).

11-8. Regarding claim 18, Fane further discloses that the model is a parametric model (Mechanical Desktop is a feature-based parametric solid modeler, page 70, column 1, paragraph 1).

11-9. Regarding claim 21, Fane discloses that the Mechanical Desktop establishes a link to an external Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (page 74, Figure 5) but fails to explicitly disclose the step of registering the EAP with the CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callback registration includes the function to be called and optional application-data to be passed (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to improve the portability.

**11-10.** Regarding claim 22, Fane discloses that the Mechanical Desktop establishes a link to an external Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (page 74, Figure 5) but fails to explicitly disclose the registration of a callback to the EAP from the CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback to the EAP from the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to improve the portability.

### ***Applicants' Arguments***

**12.** Applicants argue the following:

**12-1.** (1) Rejection of claims 1-22 based on § 112, First Paragraph; “the reference to Pro/Engineer 2000i is not an attempt to incorporate the details of the software Application by reference, but rather an attempt to note the software Application as a typical CAD/CAM package to which the present invention applies” (page 4, paper # 7).

**12-2.** (2) Rejection of claims 13, 14 and 26 based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph; “Claims 13, 14 and 26 have been amended” (page 5, paper # 7).

**12-3.** (3) Rejection of claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 19-20 and 23-26 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a);

(3.1) “The CAD model does not feed values to the Excel spreadsheet after the association between the two files has been established” (page 5, paper # 7).

(3.2) "Fane discloses only a one way communication process for the data" (page 6, paragraph 1, paper # 7).

(3.3) "Excel is not receiving data from AutoCAD" (page 6, paragraph 3, paper # 7).

(3.4) "claim 7 which provides that at any time a model is modified the system automatically determines if the EAP has to be executed, and automatically executes it" (page 7, paragraph 1, paper # 7).

(3.5) "claim 8 has been modified to clarify that an object method is contained within the record of the model" (page 7, paragraph 2, paper # 7).

(3.6) "claim 19 indicates that the step of determining that the modifying of the model requires recalculation of the output data from the EAP is performed automatically by the computer system and not by the user" (page 8, paragraph 2, paper # 7).

12-4. (4) Rejection of claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-18 and 21-22 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103; "Neither Fane or Cottrell et al teach or disclose the step of calling the EAP to update the output data as a result of changes in the model" (page 10, paragraph 1, paper # 7).

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered.

13-1. Response to Applicants' argument (1). Applicants' have submitted the Pro/Engineer 2000i material in paper # 9 and amended claims 13 and 14 in paper # 7. The original claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been withdrawn. However, due to the added new matter in claim 8, claims 8-14 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as detailed in section 7 above.

**13-2.** Response to Applicants' argument (2). The original claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness have been withdrawn.

**13-3.** Response to Applicants' argument (3). Arguments (3.1) to (3.6) are not persuasive. Regarding (3.2) and (3.3), (3.1) confirms that the CAD model does feed values to the Excel spreadsheet at least at setup. Regarding (3.4) and (3.6), "automatically" has not been claimed. Besides, "making automatic" is considered to be a routine expedient. Regarding (3.5), it does not appear to be supported by the original specification, as detailed in section 7 above.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 19-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), as detailed in sections 9-1 to 9-16 above.

**13-4.** Response to Applicants' argument (4). (3.1) confirms that the CAD model does feed values to the Excel spreadsheet at least at setup. The claim language does not exclude the possibility of feeding values to the Excel spreadsheet using setup.

Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as detailed in sections 11-1 to 11-10 above.

### ***Conclusion***

**14.** Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after




the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Herng-der Day whose telephone number is (703) 305-5269. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 17:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin J Teska can be reached on (703) 305-9704. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Herng-der Day  
July 26, 2003

  
HUGH JONES Ph.D.  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100